	Case 1:21-cv-01491-NONE-SKO Docum	nent 6	Filed 10/13/21	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6 7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	CHRISTOPHER JOHNSON,	Case I	No.: 1:21-cv-014	91-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,			
13	V.	ORDI TO P	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	CAUSE WHY MOTION ORMA PAUPERIS
14	LT. FLORES,		SHOULD NOT BE DENIED	
15	Defendant.	21-DA	21-DAY DEADLINE	
16				
17	Plaintiff Christopher Johnson has filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP")			
18	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (Doc. 2.) According to the certified account statement submitted by			
19	the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Plaintiff had \$1,535.39 in his inmate			
20	trust account as of July 15, 2021. (Doc. 5.) As of September 17, 2021, Plaintiff had \$433.60 in his			
21	account. This is enough to pay the \$402 filing fee in this action. Therefore, Plaintiff must show			
22	why he is entitled to proceed in forma pauperis.			
23	Proceeding "in forma pauperis is a privilege not a right." Smart v. Heinze, 347 F.2d 114,			
24	116 (9th Cir. 1965). While a party need not be completely destitute to proceed in forma pauperis,			
25	Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339-40 (1948), "the same even-handed			
26	care must be employed to assure that federal funds are not squandered to underwrite, at public			
27	expense, either frivolous claims or the remonstrances of a suitor who is financially able, in whole			

or in material part, to pull his own oar," Doe v. Educ. Enrichment Sys., No. 15-cv-2628-MMA-

28

MDD, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173063, *2 (S.D. Cal. 2015) (citation omitted). Hence, "the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that the [plaintiff's] allegation of poverty is untrue." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(A). According to his inmate trust account, Plaintiff has adequate funds to pay the filing fee for this action. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff, within 21 days of the date of service of this order, to show cause in writing why his motion to proceed IFP should not be denied. Failure to respond to this order may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to obey a court order. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Sheila K. Oberto Dated: October 13, 2021 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Case 1:21-cv-01491-NONE-SKO Document 6 Filed 10/13/21 Page 2 of 2